



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/071,750	02/06/2002	Hyug Man Kweon	51876p291	1605	
8791	7590 04/22/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	SOKOLOFF TAYLO	GANTT, ALAN T			
	HIRE BOULEVARD, SI ES, CA 90025	EVENTH FLOOR	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
2007111022	20, 0.1 70025		2684	8	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/071,750	KWEON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Alan T. Gantt	2684
The MAILING E	ATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be a after SIX (6) MONTHS from - If the period for reply specification of the period for reply is specification. - Failure to reply within the se	OF THIS COMMUNICATION vailable under the provisions of 37 CFR of the mailing date of this communication, ed above is less than thirty (30) days, a redified above, the maximum statutory period to rextended period for reply will, by statifice later than three months after the mail	PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile tile the ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE liling date of this communication, even if timely file	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a) ☐ This action is FI 3) ☐ Since this applic	cation is in condition for allow	February 2002. nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, profer Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	
Disposition of Claims			
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/s 7) ☐ Claim(s)	are rejected.	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers			
10) The drawing(s) f Applicant may not Replacement draw	request that any objection to the wing sheet(s) including the corre	ner. ccepted or b) objected to by the se drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob Examiner. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119		
a)⊠ All b)□ Son 1.⊠ Certified of 2.□ Certified of 3.□ Copies of application	ne * c) None of: copies of the priority documer copies of the priority documer the certified copies of the pri n from the International Burea	nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		_	
	ratent Drawing Review (PTO-948) atement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 2684

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baranowski et al.

Regarding claim 1, Baranowski discloses a folder-type mobile communication terminal having a double-sided LCD, comprising:

a first LCD panel; (page 4, lines 8-25)

a second LCD panel; (page 4, lines 8-25) and

a backlight means, which is interposed between the first and second LCD panels, for bi-directionally illuminating the first and second LCD panels, (page 4, line 20 to page 5, line 6) wherein the backlight means includes;

line 6) and

Art Unit: 2684

a light emitting means for emitting light; (page 4, line 23 to page 5,

a light guide plate for distributing the light emitted from the light emitting means to the first and second LCD panels. (page 4, line 20 to page 5, line 6)

Regarding claim 2, Baranowski meet the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 1, wherein the backlight means further includes two translucent films disposed on both planes of the light guide plate. (page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 1 [Figure 3 shows the two translucent film as the light gathering end of the front and rear optical guides, each of which assist in the backlighting of an LCD panel])

Regarding claim 3, Baranowski meet the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 2, wherein the light guide plate dominantly distributes uniform light to the first LCD and generates leakage light toward the second LCD. (page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 1)

Regarding claim 4, Baranowski meet the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 3, wherein the two translucent films include:

a first translucent film disposed between one plane of the light guide plate and the first LCD panel for uniformly transmitting the uniform light to the first LCD panel; (Figure 3, ref. 38 and page 4, line 20 to page 5, line 17) and

a second translucent film disposed between the other plane of the light guide plate

Art Unit: 2684

and the second LCD panel for uniformly transmitting the leakage light to the second LCD panel, wherein a light transmissivity of the first translucent film is higher than that of the second translucent film. (Figure 3, ref. 38 and page 4, line 20 to page 5, line 17 page 5, line 26 to page 6 line 1 [the light filter absorbs or redirects light incident on the rear display to improve visibility of the front display when the flip is in the open position])

Regarding claim 5, Baranowski meets the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 4, wherein the backlight means further includes a light collecting means formed at an upper portion of the light guide plate for collecting the light emitted from the light emitting means. (Figure 3 and page 4, lines 20-25)

Regarding claim 6, Baranowski meets the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 4, further comprising a power control means for controlling power of the first and second LCD panels, wherein the power control means controls that the first and second LCD panels are simultaneously or selectively illuminated according to flip stats, opening and shutting of the flip of the folder-type mobile communication terminal. (page 4, line 29 to page 5, line 2 and page 5, lines 9-16)

Regarding claim 8, Baranowski meets the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited In claim 4, wherein the light emitting means is substantially a light emitting diode (LED). (page 4, lines 23-27)

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claim 9, Baranowski meets the limitation: The folder-type mobile communication terminal as recited in claim 4, wherein the light emitting means is substantially a fluorescent lamp. (page 4, lines 23-27)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski, et al.

Regarding claim 7, Baranowski acknowledges the use of LCDs for the displays but is silent regarding the use of LCDs that emit three colors (red, green and blue).

However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to use LCD with these three colors and that it would have been obvious to modify Baranowski to include LCDs using the fore mentioned colors as this aids in the delineation of display details, especially at larger distances.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2684

Kim discloses a dual-sided liquid crystal display device that can display messages such as

information on a calling party, received message, and temporal information even when a flip

cover is not open.

Lee et al. discloses a folder-type mobile phone having a double panel LCD where at least

one face is exposed even upon closing the folder.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to

Alan Gantt at telephone number (703) 305-0077. The examiner can normally be reached

between 9:30 AM and 6 PM within the Eastern Time Zone. The group FAX number is (703)

872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to this application should be directed to the

group receptionist at telephone number (703) 305-4700.

Alan T. Gantt

Clan T. Dantt

April 15, 2004

NICK COHSARO PATENT EXAMINER

Jm-

Page 6